

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 18-5934-MWF-KSx Date: August 7, 2019

Title *Ox Labs Inc. v. Bitpay, Inc. et al.*

Present: The Honorable: Karen L. Stevenson, United States Magistrate Judge

Gay Roberson
Deputy Clerk

XTR 08/07/2019
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:
Anahit Samarjian

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
Lawrence Kunin

**Proceedings: MINUTES OF TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE RE:
DISCOVERY DISPUTE**

Case called. Counsel state their appearances. The Court held a telephonic conference with counsel for Plaintiff Ox Labs Inc. (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Bitpay, Inc. (“Defendant”) regarding certain of Plaintiff’s discovery requests that seek information concerning a 200 Bitcoin transaction that was erroneously credited to Bitpay (and related 200 Bitcoin Gold and 200 Bitcoin Cash transactions) and led to Plaintiff’s claims in this lawsuit. The disputed requests are as follows:

Interrogatory No. 2:

State how many total Bitcoins you owned on the date that you learned of the credit error that gave you Plaintiff’s 200 Bitcoins.

Interrogatory No. 3:

State how many total Bitcoins you owned on the date that you sold, traded, or exchanged Plaintiff’s 200 Bitcoins.

//

//

//

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 18-5934-MWF-KSx Date: August 7, 2019

Title *Ox Labs Inc. v. Bitpay, Inc. et al.*

Interrogatory No. 4:

State how many total Bitcoins you owned on the date that you tendered \$57,216.55 to Plaintiff.

Interrogatory No. 17:

Identify all documents that you contend determine the value or price of Bitcoin from 2015-2019.

Interrogatory No. 18,

Identify all documents that you contend determine the value or price of Bitcoin Gold from 2017-2019.

Interrogatory No. 19,

Identify all documents that you contend determine the value or price of Bitcoin Cash from 2017-2019.

Defendant responded to each of these interrogatories with boilerplate objections that the requests are irrelevant and not reasonably likely to lead to relevant evidence. With respect to Interrogatory Nos. 17, 18, and 19, Defendant also objected that the requests are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad.

Request for Production of Documents No. 5:

Bitpay's financial statements for the years 2015-2018.

Bitpay objected that RFP No. 5 seeks information that is wholly irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to relevant evidence.

After further discussion, the Court determined that the information sought in Interrogatory Nos. 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, and 19 is directly relevant to the claims and defenses at issue here and proportionate to the needs of the case under Rule 26(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. However, the Court sustains Defendant's objections to RFP No. 5, finding the request for financial statements neither relevant nor proportionate to the limited claims at issue concerning a single 200 Bitcoin transaction.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 18-5934-MWF-KSx Date: August 7, 2019

Title *Ox Labs Inc. v. Bitpay, Inc. et al.*

Accordingly, Defendant must serve complete answers to Interrogatory Nos. 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, and 19 **no later than Friday, August 9, 2019**. Plaintiff indicated it will withdraw RFP No. 5. In light of the August 9, 2019 fact discovery cut-off, the parties are advised to promptly contact the district judge to request an extension if they believe they will need more time to complete the discovery required by this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

: 17 mins

gr